

Note to readers with disabilities: *EHP* strives to ensure that all journal content is accessible to all readers. However, some figures and Supplemental Material published in *EHP* articles may not conform to [508 standards](#) due to the complexity of the information being presented. If you need assistance accessing journal content, please contact ehp508@niehs.nih.gov. Our staff will work with you to assess and meet your accessibility needs within 3 working days.

Supplemental Material

Airborne Fine Particles and Risk of Hospital Admissions for Understudied Populations: Effects by Urbanicity and Short-Term Cumulative Exposures in 708 U.S. Counties

Mercedes A. Bravo, Keita Ebisu, Francesca Dominici, Yun Wang, Roger D. Peng, and Michelle L. Bell

Table of Contents

Table S1. Characteristics of PM_{2.5} pollution data.

Table S2. Summary statistics of model evaluation for 24-h average PM_{2.5} county level exposure estimates

Figure S1. Availability of monitor data by county for the study area output (data from 2000 U.S. Census; map created using ArcGIS).

Figure S2. County-specific correlation between exposure estimates derived from observed data and CMAQds simulated PM_{2.5} concentrations for the 418 counties with monitoring data and populations $\geq 50,000$, 2002-2006 (data from 2000 U.S. Census; map created using ArcGIS). This map shows correlations between county level monitor-derived daily exposure estimates for daily county level CMAQds-derived exposure estimates. Only counties with monitoring data and populations $\geq 50,000$ are included in the comparison

Figure S3. Comparison of county-specific maximum likelihood health effect estimates obtained from monitor-derived exposure estimates (x-axis) versus CMAQds_subset-derived exposure estimates ($\hat{\beta}^c$ coefficients relating PM_{2.5} concentration to hospitalization rates in county-specific regression model): (a) cardiovascular; (b) respiratory (n=418 counties) Point size is inversely proportional to the magnitude of the standard error associated with each monitor-derived county-specific maximum likelihood health effect estimate, such that a smaller point size indicates greater uncertainty associated with that county-specific estimate. Note that these values represent coefficients that have not been scaled.

Figure S4. Percent increase in hospital admissions associated with a 10µg/m³ increase in PM_{2.5} concentration, estimated using monitoring data (gray) and downscaler output (black), only for counties with monitoring data (CMAQds_subset), by level of urbanicity (lag 0) Vertical lines represent 95% posterior intervals. Urbanicity is measured as percent of county population residing in nonurban areas